



STATEWIDE TRAINING AND EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

July 18, 2014 – Sacramento, California

Members Present:

Taral Brideau, California Fire Fighter Joint Apprenticeship Committee (alternate)
Dennis Childress, So Cal Training Officers Association
Ron Coleman, STEAC Chair
Lorenzo Gigliotti, California Governor's Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES) (alternate)
Natalie Hannum, California Fire Technology Directors Association (North)
Chris Jelinek, Nor Cal Training Officers Association
Mary Jennings, California Fire Fighter Joint Apprenticeship Committee
Kenneth Kehmna, Fire District Association of California
Ron Myers, League Of California Cities
Daren Palacios, Metro Chiefs
Kay Price, Cal Fire Academy
Stephen Shull, California Fire Technology Directors Association (South)(alternate)
Daniel Stefano, California State Firefighters' Association
Rich Thomas, California Professional Firefighters (alternate)
Ken Wagner, California Fire Chiefs Association, STEAC Vice Chair

Members Absent:

Robert Briare, California Professional Firefighters
Randy Collins, California Fire Technology Directors Association (North) (alternate)
Bret Davidson, So Cal Training Officers Association (South) (alternate)
Timi Hayward, California Fire Technology Directors Association (South)
Sam Hoffman, California State Firefighters' Association (alternate)
Jim Skinner, League of California Cities
Nathan Trauernicht, California Fire Chiefs Association
John Wagner, Nor CAL Training Officers Association (alternate)
Kim Zagaris, California Governor's Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES)

State Fire Training Staff:

Kevin Brame, Fire Service Training Specialist III
Joseph Bunn, Fire Service Training Specialist III
Mike Garcia, Deputy State Fire Marshal III Specialist
Ron Martin, Fire Service Training Specialist III
Linda Menchaca, Associate Governmental Programs Analyst
Susan Pineau, Management Services Technician
Diane Radford, Division Support
Brandon Erickson, Certification Exam Coordinator
Mike Richwine, Assistant State Fire Marshal and Division Chief
Mark Romer, Fire Service Training Specialist III
Kris Rose, Staff Services Manager I
Rodney Slaughter, Deputy State Fire Marshal III Specialist

Guests:

Stan Klopfenstein, Santa Clara Fire Department (retired)
Alex Cabasa, California Governor's Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES)
Scott Vail, California Governor's Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES)
Len Chesmore, California Governor's Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES)
William Melendez, El Camino College

I. Introductions and Welcome

Chief Coleman called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

A. Roll Call/Quorum Established

A quorum was established during introductions.

II. Agenda Review

Chief Coleman asked for any changes to the agenda or if any members needed to exit the meeting early. Chief Richwine stated he needed to step out at 10:00 a.m. and expected to return shortly.

III. Approval of the April 18, 2014 Minutes

Motion: *Mary Jennings moved to accept the minutes from April 18, 2014, and Dan Stefano seconded the motion.*
Action: *All members voted unanimously.*

IV. State Board of Fire Services (SBFS) Update

On May 22, 2014 at the SBFS meeting several Accreditations and Re-Accreditations were submitted for final approval. They were all approved. Fresno City College and Merritt College were approved for Accreditation. Bakersfield College, the Los Angeles Fire Department and Sierra College were approved for Re-Accreditation. Trench rescue will be discussed later in this meeting. Chief Coleman indicates that STEAC exists for a purpose, and that the SBFS is accepting our work without debate.

V. Mission Alignment Objectives**A. Achieving National Recognition****1. Discussion: Sierra College Fire Fighter I Beta Test**
Presenter: Ken Wagner
(Attachment 1)

The Fire Fighter I curriculum beta test and exam process for certification was delivered by Sierra College as part of the spring 2014 Fire Fighter I Academy. On May 9, 2014, Sierra College hosted the California Fire Technology Directors

Association (CFTDA) for a briefing on the examination process. On May 10, 2014, the first day of skills testing was done and CFTDA observed the new procedures that were developed. For the written portion of the examination a third party vendor was used and items were found that required additional review.

In a discussion regarding the written exams, Natalie Hannum advised that the exams indicate the scores are clustered together, and lacked academic rigor. Chief Coleman said that we need to look at the Firefighter I process, perhaps as a small group that continues with the test process to produce more candidates for the Fire Fighter I job. Mark Romer advised there are two issues with this. First there is the need for instructors to hold students to a higher level and secondly a more rigorous test is needed. It is hard to make mandates requiring certain data for exams at the entry level. Certification Training Standards were not designed for Firefighter specific testing if they have basic reading, writing, and physics skills. N. Hannum indicated that testing uses 7th grade science and physics courses and kids don't know the answers.

Ken Wagner advised that this is only a part of what Firefighter qualification standards need and more data may need to be looked at. M. Romer indicated that the data stayed the same from previous academy testing. Chief Coleman said that this is a legitimate concern, and can be fixed. He advised that M. Romer is continuing to use this testing process with another academy, and should have more details on pass/fail rates at the January STEAC meeting. K. Wagner drafted a letter to the Sierra College President for Chief Richwine's signature thanking them for participating in the testing. Chief Coleman advised that these discussion topics indicate good staff work is being done.

2. Discussion: Fire Fighter I Certification Examination Process

Presenter: Ken Wagner
(Attachment 2)

Ken Wagner stated at the July 2013 STEAC meeting, he provided a staff report that discussed the whole certification examination process and how we might implement IFSAC and Pro Board national recognition. Those two discussion items were bifurcated, so there are now two staff reports. One is addressing the Fire Fighter I certification examination process and the other is to simply give you an update about what's been occurring regarding implementation of certification since July 2013. Significant discussions occurred during that STEAC meeting, and subsequently we received written comments. Chief Richwine and Chief Hoover met with representatives from California Professional Firefighters to address concerns that were raised about the process. K. Wagner was advised to start what Chief Coleman would refer to as "missionary work" by visiting SFT stakeholders and seeing what concerns they have about the process.

A map of the state of California was distributed that indicates the location of all Accredited Regional Training Programs (ARTP) showing a 50 mile radius from each location. The map clearly shows the areas within California that are underserved and not represented by an ARTP. We do have commitments so far from some of our ARTPs to help deliver the examination process within these underserved areas. These colleges are: Sierra College, the South Bay Regional Training Consortium and the Alan Hancock College. We are having significant dialog on ways in which we can close the gaps. This is part of our ongoing process. We must have access on a statewide basis in order to have statewide implementation, and we are continuing to work on that effort.

K. Wagner said that meetings have already been held with the California Fire Chiefs Association Board of Directors, Nor Cal and So Cal Training Officer's Board of Directors, California Fire Technology Directors Association, Accredited Local Academies, California State Firefighters' Association Board of Directors, Los Angeles Area Fire Chiefs Association Regional Training Group, FIRESCOPE Board of Directors and the California Metro Fire Chiefs Association. We are continuing to work with the League of California Cities and the Fire Districts Association of California (FDAC) to meet with their Board to discuss this subject in greater detail.

K. Wagner recognized Ken Kehmna's leadership as a vital role as the FDAC representative on STEAC with getting the information back to the FDAC so they are updated on the certification exam process. The feedback received has been positive. Suggestions have been made to make changes to different ways of doing things and a lot of these have been worked into the draft procedures.

The goal at the January 2015 STEAC meeting is to ask the STEAC members for approval of the certification exam process and subsequently ask for approval from the State Board of Fire Services (SBFS) at its February 2015 Board meeting. Our goal prior to the end of 2015 is to have achieved national accreditation with IFSAC and Pro Board. Chief Richwine commented that this aligns with the Blue Print 2020 goals and the entire process.

Chief Coleman brought up a concern about access for the volunteer fire service. Chief Coleman asked Chris Jelinek about Humboldt County and Del Norte counties, if there are any possibilities of any dialog occurring with the points of contact up there. C. Jelinek responded that there are some internal struggles being faced and the bottom line is they need to become an ARTP. College of the Redwoods has ended their Fire Technology program due to lack of funding. The preference is that the rural areas find ways to take care of their own rather than bringing in people from other colleges. Finding the time and resources to become accredited is an internal challenge. Chief Richwine indicates that a trip north to continue outreach to some of the Volunteer Fire Departments may be necessary to close the loop.

K. Wagner asked that if anyone knows of a group that needs to hear this message to please let him know so he can set up travel dates to get the word out. If this is administered properly, this will level the playing field for all the candidates on a statewide basis.

3. Discussion: Implementation of IFSAC/Pro Board Certification
Presenter: Ken Wagner
(Attachment 3)

The second item discussed at the July 2013 STEAC meeting was the idea of how we would implement the IFSAC and Pro Board certification process at the conclusion of a candidate completing their Fire Fighter I training. The staff recommendation was that we roll up both the IFSAC/Pro Board and California certification into one and make it a requirement. This would mean that if you met the qualifications for certification in California you would also receive IFSAC/Pro Board certification. There was a lot of concern raised about this. During internal discussions, it has been determined that the implementation plan now would be that California certification would still be required. Candidates would pay their \$40 fee to get their California Fire Fighter I certification, and could also choose to obtain IFSAC and Pro Board certification for an additional \$40 fee.

Chief Coleman said that traveling around the country he has found that there are a lot of Fire Fighters working in Texas, New Mexico, Arizona and Nevada who received their training in California and then got hired in those states. Chief Richwine indicated that currently Department of Defense (DoD) Fire Fighters returning to California after their service can't get recognition for any of their DoD training. There is no reciprocity. Mark Romer indicated this was introduced at the last Sierra College Academy and 100% said they would buy into IFSAC and Pro Board if it gave them the ability to move outside of California. Natalie Hannum indicated that Oklahoma and Texas have unemployment rates of about 5.9% and California is at 9.1% so it's clear where the jobs are located.

Ken Wagner indicated that a procedures manual has been developed to allow implementation of the certification examinations process and issuing certifications to meet the IFSAC and Pro Board requirements. Internal procedures and forms have been developed to help with this implementation. An agreement was implemented with Performance Training Systems (3rd party) for the written online exam process. The written examinations for Fire Fighter I have been developed. We are continuing work behind the scenes to ensure everything is in place to achieve accreditation with IFSAC and Pro Board. If we do not have approval to implement the certification examination process we will not achieve accreditation with IFSAC or Pro Board.

Steve Shull asked if the cost for IFSAC/Pro Board certification was going to stay voluntary and Ken Wagner advised yes it would.

4. Discussion: El Camino College Reaccreditation

Presenter: Rodney Slaughter
(Attachment 4)

El Camino College was originally accredited back in 1997/1998. The site visit included Darren Palacios, Tracy Rickman as the Community College representative and Sam Hoffman, representing STEAC. The site visit validated that they still have a strong program. They have a low student to instructor ratio. Some of the fire academy staff has been there 20 years. They are very familiar with the new Fire Fighter I curriculum and program. They have established a really good relationship with the local oil industry. Cadets that go through the academy are exposed to Industrial Fire Fighting as well as flammable liquids. They have an opportunity to go through 3 or 4 live fires before finishing the academy.

The site team's recommendation is to re-accredit them, as they are a very strong program. Bill Melendez of El Camino College indicates that they believe they need to produce a better product, and they are working very hard to do so. They have been working on the new Firefighter I curriculum and it is pretty much done. The curriculum has given them two days of wildfire training, where they get a chance to work with the helicopters and hand crew.

They have been working hard to ensure that they have the standards and the ability to develop the top people. The Fire Academy #138 that just graduated had a low score of 92 and a high score of 98. They reinforce that this is a career not a job. The academy is acquiring a lot of new equipment with adoption of the new Firefighter I standards. Students are required now to rent turnouts and to buy helmets. Total costs for the academy is very low.

Motion: *Ron Myers moved to approve the reaccreditation of El Camino College. Daren Palacios seconded the motion.*

Action: *All members voted unanimously.*

B. Curriculum Development & Delivery

1. Discussion: NWCG/NIMS/CICCS Update

Presenter: Mike Garcia
(Attachment 5)

At the July 2013 STEAC meeting this was a CICCS update only, and we have since added NWCG and NIMS. This document, with the attachments, shifts or transitions the coursework away from NWCG coursework and into NIMS and show how it impacts State Fire Training and it's delivery of these courses. Alex Cabasa from the California Governor's Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES), and Scott Vail, Deputy Chief with Cal OES are present to answer any questions. In Phase 1 of the transition

plan, most of these courses are the general and command staff positions, but they now include ICS 100, 200, 300 and 400. ICS 100 and 200 will be IS courses thru NIMS. After October 1, 2014 you must be a NIMS instructor to deliver these courses. This will have an impact on the instructor as to how they deliver these courses.

A spreadsheet was provided to STEAC members providing information related to the revenue generated by these courses to State Fire Training (SFT). This is revenue that we are trying not to lose by the changes in the way these courses are offered. There is a potential for SFT to lose \$48, 880 during Phase 1 and \$54, 000 in Phase 2. That's a considerable amount of revenue that would potentially not be coming into SFT. Chief Richwine tasked Mike Garcia to work with A. Cabasa and S. Vail to look at solutions for SFT. M. Garcia will be bringing a package for review to the October 17, 2014 STEAC meeting.

The transition plan goes into effect from NWCG on October 1, 2014. The instructors will need access to Cal OES, who will also be the keeper of this coursework. There is a one year open period for current SFT Registered Instructors to apply to Cal OES to get NIMS instructor approval. This letter was sent on March 10, 2014 to all SFT Registered Instructors. The SFT Registered Instructors have until March 2015 to make this transition. The letter went out through FIRESCOPE and various networks. It was noticed that there was a lack of SFT Registered Instructors compared to the list of classes that had been created. Chief Coleman wanted to know how many SFT Registered Instructors would be affected by this. M. Garcia indicated that he believed there were about 300 but not all of them may be active instructors.

During the discussion, it was confirmed that the ICS 100 and 200 will be online courses. NWCG is giving ICS courses back to FEMA and NWCG and will concentrate on the wild land arena. SFT is giving certificates based on NWCG, however going forward that will not be supported. These will all be FEMA and they have a different certification process for the "I" courses than what we are used to. Chief Coleman asked what we do now to ensure there are no future complaints about people indicating they were never told this.

M. Garcia indicted this is why this is an informational item and hopes that the STEAC members can assist with the dissemination of the information. In addition, we can put a link to the Cal OES website on the SFT website. We are trying to fix this, so existing SFT Registered Instructors would potentially have access to the 300/400 material. Potentially they could get the material through a new link embedded in SFT Course Information and Required Materials (CIRM).

Mark Romer asked for confirmation that IS 100/200 instructors won't be sent through historical recognition since they are online classes. S. Vail indicated that is correct. Natalie Hannum advised based on statistics that less students are getting this information. Looking at the information, there is a supply and demand entity provider issue.

In terms of a communication question, this issue, Rodney Slaughter advised, was brought before STEAC two years ago. To M. Garcia's credit, he has been able to synthesize the data and provide some type of analysis so we understand the actual

impact. A synthesis and analysis of the overall impact is an important part that connects this process.

Ken Wagner indicated that one of the things that he sees that is most fundamental is that we cannot expect that every SFT Registered Instructor will be accepted during this historical recognition period because the instructor requirements that are now coming in place for this exceed SFT requirements for ICS instructors. S. Vail indicated that yes he believes this is correct. There are different training requirements. M. Garcia indicated that this information for the NIMS courses is in the packet.

K. Wagner indicated that it is important to daylight this and not assume, just because they are instructors that they are going to move forward just because the process is more arduous to obtain and retain instructor status. S. Vail indicates that they don't have to be a SFT Registered Instructor. There are other paths for them to get to the instructor level. On the document that was distributed by Cal OES, under Item H, it indicates that current SFT Registered Instructors, who are already in our system, have the opportunity to use this as a base to get in. K. Wagner indicated that this process will require someone to be an active practicing instructor. Although there are other methods for instructors to get in, rather than the SFT route, most likely the list of instructors will be condensed. This may lock out good qualified instructors.

FEMA will track instructors as they register a course. They will have a decertification process as well, for those instructors that are not teaching. This may be a two year period. Chief Coleman indicated that he has heard that there is tracking on a national and international level. This is much bigger than the state of California. M. Garcia indicated that in looking at the Cal OES schedule of courses, he saw that there is an institution called Texas A&M Engineering Extension Service (Teex). They have instructors in California who are delivering the I-300 to non-fire department agencies who are now going into type 3 incident management. Chief Coleman said they are doing this under contract. Dennis Childress asked if courses will expand further than the courses listed. M. Garcia said the true wild land courses will stay. The second list is Phase Two. We are waiting on information for what courses will be included. M. Garcia indicated to contact him if anyone has any further questions.

2. Discussion: Executive Chief Fire Officer Standards and Curriculum

Presenter: Kevin Brame
(Attachment 6)

Kevin Brame presented for approval the standards and curriculum for the new Executive Chief Fire Officer curriculum. Chief Coleman stated that he has been besieged by people saying we are dummifying down our curriculum. He wants to know what the STEAC members have to say. Natalie Hannum says that she feels we are realigning, not dummifying down, the national standards. We are taking this back to the nationally known standard. We can build up from there but we need a firmer

foundation because without a firm foundation you have a house of cards. Chief Coleman said that we need to be unified in what the construct of our standards basis is. Once our foundation is established, we are going to have a lifelong challenge of continuing education components. Because the fire service is subject to almost constant change, we will need to address these changes in another fashion. Dan Stefano says he's heard we are making things more positive and challenging.

Motion: *Natalie Hannum moved to approve the Executive Chief Fire Officer Standards and Curriculum, Dan Stefano seconded the motion.*

Action: *All members voted unanimously.*

3. Discussion: Instructor III Standards and Curriculum

Presenter: Ron Martin

(Attachment 7)

Ron Martin presented for approval the Instructor III standards and curriculum. Chief Coleman asked R. Martin to provide a brief on what the consequences are for the academy. Some training positions are now being civilianized. We are now looking at a standard where people understand what it takes to deliver adult learning. Our Master Instructor class was focused on ideas and concepts and presentation skills. It was not focused on how to address adult learning principles or an adult training program. We now have a high focus on adult learning and skills and how to run an instructional program. The course plan and research we put together is better than that at the fire academy course. What we are looking at now is a new frontier to hold those in influence of adult training, to have a road map on how to do that. Chief Coleman says our program will not be successful unless we set standards to a high level. The standard is for excellence not for mediocrity.

Motion: *Ken Kehmna moved to approve the Instructor III Standards and Curriculum. Ken Wagner seconded the motion.*

Action: *All members voted unanimously.*

4. Discussion: Community Risk Educator, Community Risk Specialist, Community Risk Officer, Standards & Curriculum

Presenter: Joe Bunn

(Attachment 8)

This program is a new series of classes broken into three different tracks for the Community Risk Officer. The standard for curriculum is based on the NFPA 1035, the Professional Qualifications for Fire and Life Safety Educator 1, 2, 3, Public Information Officer, Juvenile Fire Setter Intervention Specialist 1 and 2. Joe Bunn thanked the development and validation cadre members.. He indicated that they have a passion regarding the training tracks and course plans that were developed. It was determined that each job title, and corresponding levels of expertise, should

be organized according to the level of experience required to obtain each certification.

Trying to fit all the pieces together, the cadre, using their expertise and experience, tried to fit the standard into three different Certification Training Standards (CTS). The first one being the Community Risk Educator, the second being the Community Risk Specialist and the last one being the Community Risk Officer, in that order. The development of the three CTSs incorporates a series of pre-requisites prior to attending each course. The development cadre created course plans for all three certifications. The pre-requisites for the new courses are outlined in the attachment. Each course is designed to build on the prior course.

Chief Richwine indicated it is our intent to retire the Public Educator Certification in lieu of Community Risk Officer. Natalie Hannum asked if this can be coincided with certificate training on the law enforcement side and Joe Bunn said no, it is completely different.

Chief Coleman asked if it is a prerequisite that they have to be uniformed firefighters. Joe Bunn advised no it is not and it was discussed that there is an opportunity for volunteers. Chief Richwine wanted to know if at the next meeting will there be implementation plans and timelines. Kevin Brame and Kris Rose advised these would be made available.

Mary Jennings wanted to know if the title would be changed from public education to community risk officer. Does this replace the public information certification track? Chief Richwine indicated yes it does and it was confirmed that the training standard and course plan are all included in this package. Joe Bunn advised that the educational part augments what the national standards are. Each certification track was kept in alignment. Chief Coleman indicated this is a task in mission alignment and the title change is more appropriate.

5. Discussion: Trench Rescue Technician Training

Presenter: Rodney Slaughter
(Attachment 9)

Chief Richwine briefed everyone at the last STEAC meeting regarding the type and size of lumber necessary for a trench rescue. His meeting with the FIREScope task force and with Stan Klopfenstein resulted in the communication and equipment issues being resolved. Rodney Slaughter handed out the FIREScope Task Force letter and indicated there is new tabulated data. Stan Klopfenstein indicated that the manual is complete and ready for publishing. They are working with SFT and the California Fire and Rescue Training Authority (CFRTA) for the instructor updates. The first update will be held at the Fresno Training Officers Symposium. There are over 700 registered trench instructors in the state, but we are going to confine the rollouts to active instructors, which is about 100. We have developed the options for the uprights for FIREScope. We had those options engineered and we also made proposed options for the Operational System Description lumber cache which was approved by the FIREScope Board of Directors. That change in the lumber cache will help meet the request of FIREScope for Trench Rescue.

Questions were asked about where we are getting the tabulated data from. The tabulated data was developed using the values from the national design specifications for wood construction by the American Forest and Paper Association that are the same standards adopted by all U.S. Building Codes. The soil loading values were developed using the parent earth pressure theory which is an industry standard. Engineering judgment is applied and drawn from 25 years of experience in excavation and shoring system design by our registered professional engineer. We found two additional FEMA engineers to support our data. One of them is the head structural engineer for the 8 FEMA teams in California.

Another question that was asked was what the difference is between engineer types. Registered Engineer versus Structural Engineer versus a Soils Engineer and so forth. Stan Klopfenstein explained that there is a pecking order, when you become certified as an engineer you are a registered professional engineer. When you go into engineering, structural or mechanical, it is a specialty just like a Dr. that requires additional and specialized training.

Motion: Mary Jennings moved to approve the Trench Rescue Technician Training. Ron Myers seconded the motion.
Action: All members voted unanimously.

6. Discussion: Upcoming Curriculum Projects for 2014/2015

**Presenter: Kevin Brame
(Attachment 10)**

Kevin Brame announced the upcoming curriculum projects for 2014/2015. Already there have been a robust response for potential cadre members. The lowest number so far have been right around 26 interested persons for a given course. On track and funded as of July 1, 2014 we are looking to get a curriculum cadre in place. Our target date is by September 15, 2014 and the goal is to have everything completed by June 30, 2015.

We have a number of F-Step courses that will be worked on. We have 5 classes within the Chief Officer realm and 3 classes within the Instructor realm. We also have Fire Control 3A and 3B, Fire Control 4A, and 4B. On the certification track side, we have the Emergency Vehicle Technician and Apparatus Driver/Operator. The list of courses is fairly robust. We are meeting with and continuing to use the editors from Sacramento State which is working very well.

This fiscal year, one of the things we are looking at is the idea of continued education by researching and reaching out to stakeholders and extracting information we hope to develop a draft of a plan for continuing education. The other area is with Fire Investigation. We want to take a look at what is out there. This area is becoming more specialized and more of a risk management concern. The need is to go out and meet with individuals to determine if there are other

certification processes out there that would better suit our needs, rather than trying to develop something in house.

Also Plans Examiner has been slated for revision. This has been through the process once before but due to stakeholder feedback; it will need to be revised again before coming back for STEAC approval.

Under the management courses we have Incident Management of Multiple Alarm Fires, Special Operations and High Rise Fires. There was some concern that these courses were going away. Courses which have been retired and which will no longer be used towards certification will be updated and be brought back as FSTEP courses.

Dan Stefano asked if anyone has reached out to the Mechanics Academy up in Chico. K. Brame advised that we are not moving forward on this curriculum yet. Although it has been funded, we are still working on some policy issues and are not yet to the point of soliciting cadre members. Chief Richwine indicated their system is unique. Their certification process is where we strive to get to. They already develop their own courses, issue their own exams and maintain their own publications and manuals. They do this with our approval and we issue the certifications. The concern is that we don't have any kind of certification training standards and are not in the loop on a lot of those publications. We need to talk to them about working closer together.

Ken Kehmna asked how someone becomes a part of the cadre. Kris Rose advised that they can go to the SFT website and complete the application. K. Brame indicated that each of the cadre leads will sort through and select diverse cadre members. On August 4, 2014, there is a meeting in Sacramento, and the selection will be done at that time. Each cadre lead is being asked to select one person for this year's cadre that was on last year's cadre. The goal is to mentor them to create new cadre leads for the third year.

A notice has been sent out to all Registered Instructors and SFT Stakeholders that the Instructor Update Course is retiring as of Dec 31, 2014. Registered Instructors who have not completed the course will not be eligible to remain as an SFT Registered Instructor. The courses are October 6, 7, 8 at Orange County Fire Authority, and November 6, 7 at California Fire and Rescue Training Authority. K. Rose also advised that this information is on the SFT website under Hot Topics.

VI. Announcements/Correspondence

Presenter: Ron Coleman

- A. Chief Gigliotti indicated that the new head of the joint powers authority as of July 1, 2014 is Ruben Grijalva of the California Fire and Rescue Training Authority.

VII. Roundtable

A. Discussion: Course Prerequisites

Presenter: Dennis Childress

Dennis Childress indicated that in his observation few instructors are asking for prerequisites. Having sat in some of the curriculum, he says it is important to get coursework assimilation. It is listed in the Code of Ethics that they must meet the prerequisites and some colleges and instructors are not meeting this requirement. Chief Coleman said there needs to be accountability and we need to find a solution. In accepting liability, if not a SFT course, we cannot confirm if a prerequisite was taken elsewhere. Natalie Hannum said from a college perspective, the private provider versus the college environment becomes an issue as well. From a college perspective they have not met the prerequisite requirements. Chief Coleman asked if this is a policy question or not.

Chief Coleman said that we have been put on notice that we have a deficiency. Chief Richwine advised that STEAC needs to put a task force together to address this issue. Ron Martin said we need to look at prerequisite and validation standards taken from NFPA 1041. Chief Richwine indicates there are two issues. First is establishing a prerequisite and then following up to ensure this is being done. Dennis Childress advises that instructors, per the Code of Ethics, should be held accountable for ensuring this is done. He advised that a working group may be a good option. N. Hannum offered an invitation to all STEAC members to attend the California Fire Technology Directors' Association (CFTDA) meeting on September 26, 2014. Rodney Slaughter and D. Childress will attend this meeting. Kevin Brame advises that the community college is not the only area we need to look at. There is a need to address the private provider arena as well. Chief Richwine confirmed that this would be done.

Motion: Dennis Childress moved to create a working group to look into the issue and potential solution of course pre-requisites. Rich Thomas seconded the motion.

Action: All members voted unanimously.

VIII. Future Meeting Dates

A. October 17, 2014, January 16, 2015 and April 17, 2015

IX. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 11:35 a.m.